IRISH
BIBLICAL
STUDIES

Contents

Book Reviews

THE HAUSTAFEL IN EPHESIANS (EPH. 5.22-6.9)

Professor E. Best

There is no intention in this paper of exploring in detail the moral teaching of the Ephesian Haustafel. By and large its ethic does not differ greatly from Jewish and pagan contemporary teaching where Jewish and pagan husbands expected obedience from their wives, from their children and from their slaves; we find the same in the Haustafel in Ephesians. The main difference from pagan and Jewish teaching lies in the Christian motivation. We shall not then be examining the ethical teaching in detail but instead looking at the place of the Haustafel in the whole argument of the letter, at the relevance of its teaching to the Christian households of the ancient world and at whether it existed prior to its use in Ephesians. In recent years the Haustafel form has been the object of considerable attention and listed at the end of the paper are some of the more important books and articles on the subject.

The Haustafel in Ephesians consists of three sections referring respectively to the relationships between wives and husbands, children and parents, slaves and masters. A normal ancient household would have contained at least all these three sets of relationships; the husband, the father and the master would have been normally the same person. Even what we would describe today as middle-class households probably contained at least one slave; small businesses would have had one or more who would have lived in the household of the owner. In each section of the Haustafel the duty of the 'inferior' in the relationship is put first. Sometimes commentators describe the relationships as mutual or reciprocal, but this is incorrect. A mutual or reciprocal relationship is one in which each side has exactly the same relation to the other as the other has to it. A typical mutual or reciprocal relationship lies in the summons to 'love one another'. There is an example of it in 5.21. But the relationship of husband to wife in the Haustafel is not the same as that of wife to husband. What we have are three paired relationships. Before proceeding further it is necessary to say

something about Ephesians itself. As the textual evidence in relation to 1.1 shows it was not written to the church in Ephesus and probably not indeed to any particular congregation. It was originally sent to a group of congregations in Asia Minor or to Christians generally who lived in that area.

Colossians has a similar Haustafel (3.18-4.1) and, more generally, most scholars accept the existence of some kind of relation between this letter and Ephesians. There are five possible solutions to the nature of this relationship: both letters were written by Paul, both letters were written by someone other than Paul, Paul wrote Colossians and the author of Ephesians used it, Paul wrote Ephesians and the author of Colossians used it, Paul wrote neither letter and the two letters were written by two different people. It is unnecessary at this point to decide between these though later it may be possible to suggest which are less probable.

While the Haustafel in Ephesians is similar to that in Colossians there are also considerable differences between them, most noticeably in respect of the amount of attention given to each of the paired relationships. Ephesians devotes twelve verses to the wife-husband relation and develops it into a discussion of Christ and the church; Colossians has only two verses, one relating to the husband and one to the wife and does not mention the church. Ephesians has four verses on the child-parent relation, three given over to the conduct of children and one to that of the parent; Colossians has again just one verse for each group in the pair. Both letters take five verses to cover the slave-master relation with four going in each case to the conduct of the slave and only one to that of the owner or master.

The most significant feature about the Haustafel in each letter is that it covers only households where all of the members are believers. We should not be misled by the word children; nothing is said about their age; in both the Greco-Roman and Jewish worlds children were expected to be obedient to their parents into adulthood; thus believing children, young adults, as distinct from babes in arms are included. Neither Haustafel then covers the situation of mixed households where some believe and others do not. This, that the households which are considered consist only of believers, is

surprising and requires fuller examination. Had the author of Ephesians been considering mixed household he would not have been able to parallel the relation of husbands and wives with that of Christ and the church as he does in 5.22-33.

I Peter also contains a Haustafel (2.13-3.7). Some doubt exists as to whether 1 Pet 2.13-3.7 should be termed a Haustafel since it contains a section (2.13-17) on the relation of believers to the state, and the state is of course, outside the household. It has however been customary to apply the term also to it, though it might be better to describe as a 'social code' what we find in Colossians, Ephesians and 1 Peter; however since it has become customary to apply the word Haustafel (the term goes back to Martin Luther) to the equivalent sections in these three letters and to material also in some of the other New Testament letters, we shall, for simplicity's sake, continue to use it, though recognising its inadequacy. The Haustafel in 1 Peter again covers three areas of conduct but they are not the same as those of Colossians and Ephesians.

In 1 Peter the first area, 2.13-17, relates to the behaviour of citizens towards the state. No possibility existed then of a paired relation in this area. While today church leaders may address governments and tell them how to behave the first Christians were in no position to do so and even if they did no government would have listened.

The second area in 1 Peter, 2.18-25, that of slaves and masters, is again different from the equivalent sections in Ephesians and Colossians for in 1 Peter it is only slaves who are addressed, nothing being said to masters. Thus again there is no paired relationship . Peter does not address the masters because he was toadying up to the wealthy in the congregations to which he was writing but because the masters being unbelievers were not present in the congregation to be addressed. The content of what is said to the slaves indicates that they were slaves who had domineering masters. There may have been masters who were Christians but since they would naturally treat their Christian slaves as brothers in Christ they are not in special need of counsel. Thus so far as slaves are concerned 1 Peter treats only those in mixed households. There must have been many such households and slaves in them were often in

difficult situations and much more in need of advice than those in Christian households.

In the section, 3.1-7, in 1 Peter relating to husbands and wives only one verse touches on the behaviour of husbands but six are given over to the conduct of wives. It is at once clear that the husband is envisaged as an unbeliever for the wife is instructed to win him to the faith through her quiet and submissive conduct. Thus again mixed households are principally in mind.

There is no section in 1 Peter on the behaviour of children, though young men are addressed in 5.5.

It is not surprising that 1 Peter should deal with the situation of Christians in mixed households for their position when they were the 'inferiors' must have been very difficult. Plutarch in his advice to the married and those about to marry writes 'Wherefore it is becoming for a wife to worship and to know only the gods that her husband believes in, and to shut the front door tight upon all queer rituals and outlandish superstitions' (*Coniugelia Praecepta*, Mor 140D; ET as in LCL.) To many honourable men in the ancient world Christianity would have seemed an outlandish superstition and to include queer rituals. From the Christian side the strain which could arise within a mixed household is seen in Justin Martyr's *Second Apology* 2. The position of a believing wife with an unbelieving husband must therefore at times have been intolerable. Not less would be the position of a believing slave who might be required to make preparations for and to take part in the worship of the household gods.

It is impossible to make any estimate of the proportion of unmixed and mixed households in the early church but other parts of the New Testament provide evidence as to the existence of the latter. 1 Cor. 7.12-16 refers to unbelieving spouses; if the believing spouse encounters trouble he or she is advised not to break up the marriage but to continue in the marital home so that the unbeliever may eventually be won for Christ. In 1 Cor. 7.39 Paul counsels widows to marry 'in the Lord', i.e. within the church; this instruction would have been unnecessary if some widows had not been marrying outside it. In 1 Tim. 3.1ff those eligible to be chosen as bishops should be those who manage their households properly, which seems

to mean those who have believing households; but if this has to be set down as a condition in the selection of bishops there must have been many households which were mixed (cf 1 Tim. 3.12). In 1 Tim. 6.1f slaves are told to be obedient to their masters, especially to non-believing masters. Even if it is impossible to estimate the number of mixed households it is inherently probable that there were many. Although Acts records a number of baptisms of whole households where the (male) head was converted there is no reason to suppose this always happened, and it was unlikely to have done so where the wife was converted and the husband was not. The Gospels show Jesus as teaching that individuals responding to the gospel might be forced to leave their homes and families (Mark 8.34-6; 10.21,29); the result would be the break up of homes. Even if passages like these do not go back to Jesus but are church formations they represent the experience of the church; mixed households were a normal result of Christian evangelisation.

If we accept that there were many mixed households in the early church and if Ephesians deals only with unmixed household what consequences follow?

1. In the light of the evidence from 1 Cor. chap 7 and Paul's knowledge of the lives of converts it is hardly likely that he compiled the Haustafel in Ephesians. If he received it in the tradition, whether that was Christian, Jewish or pagan in origin, it is also hardly likely that he would have used it. He had a more realistic view of the kind of people the church contained. The presence then of this Haustafel in Ephesians is a strong argument against Pauline authorship. /2. It appears that the author of Ephesians, whoever he was, did not know very much about the membership of the churches to which he was writing. If he had been intending to write only to believers living in unmixed households he would surely have made this clear somewhere in the letter.

3. It is probable then that the author of Ephesians did not himself compile the Haustafel but received it as tradition and incorporated it into his writing.

4. If he did encounter it as a piece of tradition, and took it over, this does not say much for his pastoral insight. Its use shows a singular lack of imagination and contrasts strongly with the Haustafel in 1

Peter which deals with the more difficult cases of wives married to non-Christian husbands and slaves owned by non-Christian masters. That is not to say that the author of Ephesians gives bad advice but that his advice applies only to a fraction of those to whom he writes; many would have been left untouched by his counselling.

5. The content of the Haustafel shows the danger of mirror reading the text; mirror reading consists in the deduction of information about the recipients of a letter from its content. If applied to the Haustafel it would imply that all the intended recipients of Ephesians lived in unmixed households and this is extremely unlikely. That is not to say that the technique of mirror reading cannot be used, but that it must be practised with great care. Using it, it is fair to deduce from Ephesians that Greek was understood by at least some of those to whom the letter was sent, though we cannot deduce that all of them knew Greek for those who did might have translated it into the native tongue of those who did not. The nature of the injunctions in the second part of the letter make it reasonable to assume that there were some who were thieves (4.28), some who were not always truthful (4.25), some who lost their tempers (4.26f), some men who resorted for their sexual pleasure to others than their wives (5.3). Those kind of deductions from the text are admissible.

6. A close relationship exists between Colossians and Ephesians and the Haustafel in Ephesians is in many respects similar to that in Colossians in covering the same three paired relationships, wife-husband, child-parent, slave-master. Did then the author of Ephesians derive his Haustafel from Colossians and expand it in the case of the first two pairs? Since of the three sets of relationships we find the greatest similarity in that of slaves and masters it is useful to compare them to see if, in effect, the author of Ephesians used Colossians in the section about masters and slaves. The two sections are almost the same in their first verses (Eph. 6.5; Col. 3.22) and thereafter contain a great many of the same words and phrases, e.g. ἐν ἁπλότητι (τῆς) καρδίας, ὀφθαλμοδουλία, ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις, yet these words and phrases do not always appear in the same contexts and with the same connections; for example, προσωπολημψία which is in the section on masters in Eph. 6.9 is in that on slaves in Col. 3.25, and κομίσεται is applied

differently in the two letters. Although the author of Ephesians is
interested in 'inheritance' (1.14,18; 3.6) he does not pick up the
reference to it in Col. 3.24. More significantly in Col. 3.22 slaves
are to fear the Lord but in Eph. 6.5 the fear is to be directed towards
their masters; it is hardly likely that Ephesians, if copying
Colossians, would have downgraded the fear in that way. If the
author of Colossians had been copying Ephesians it is also hardly
likely that he would have omitted the 'as to Christ' of Eph. 6.5. In
the section on children it is difficult to see why the author of
Ephesians should change the εὐάρεστον of Col. 3.22 to δίκαιον or
that the author of Colossians should carry out the reverse process. It
is therefore improbable that either author copied the letter of the
other in respect of this section of the Haustafel. These changes
between the letters also make it unlikely that both letters had a
common author. Presumably the Haustafel existed as a piece of
tradition which each used independently. Confirming this is the easy
manner in which the Haustafel of Colossians can be detached from
its context. The beginning of the Haustafel of Ephesians is grafted
into its context through 5.21 but though this verse promises a mutual
relation between members of the household this is not the way in
which the Haustafel is developed; 5.21 is therefore a verse
constructed to permit the transition from what preceded to the section
of tradition.

7. We conclude then that an existing Haustafel was incorporated
independently into the two letters. It is fairly easy to make a guess as
to its content. Since Ephesians has developed the first couple of
pairs (wife-husband, children-parents) much more than Colossians
we base our reconstruction on the form in that letter:

αἱ γυναῖκες, ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὡς ἀνῆκεν [ἐν κυρίῳ]
οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας
τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γυνεῦσιν
οἱ πατέρες, μὴ ἐρεθίζετε (παροργίζετε) τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν
οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς [κατὰ σάρκα] κυρίοις
οἱ κύριοι, τὸ δίκαιον τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε,

Wives, be subject to your husbands as is proper [in the Lord];
Husbands, love your wives.
Children, obey your parents;
Fathers, do not annoy your children.

Slaves, obey your [human] masters;

Masters treat your slaves justly.

As we have seen the third pair (slaves-owners) has been expanded in both letters using the same words but not always in the same way. Since the injunctions in the first two pairs reduce to two couplets it is probable that the third pair originally consisted also in a couplet, though it may have been expanded prior to its use in the two letters. The words in square brackets represent Christian additions, if the form was originally pre-Christian.

Two factors suggest a non-Christian origin for this brief form of the Haustafel. The first is the addition in line 5 of κατὰ σάρκα. κύριος has a special significance for Christians and the injunction to slaves required this qualification so that they should not think that they were simply told to obey Christ; it needed to be made clear that their Christian duty required obedience to their earthly owners. Though κύριος is used at times in Greek to indicate the owner or master of slaves it is not the normal word. This is δεσπότης which is found in Luke 2.29; 1 Tim. 6.1; Tit. 2.9; 1 Pet. 2.18. It is true that κύριος is used frequently in the Gospel parables of the owner or master of slaves but in each case the owner or master, whatever may have been intended in the original parable, is taken to represent God (so for the same reason in John 13.16; 15.15,20; Matt. 20.24f; Rom. 1.1,4; 1 Cor. 7.22; Jas. 1.1); moreover δεσπότης was not a usual term for God among Christians (only twice of Jesus in the NT, Jude 4; 2 Pet. 2.1. On the use of the words see H. Rengstorf, *TDNT* II pp.43-8; W. Foerster, *TDNT* III pp.1041-6). Had Christians composed the Haustafel they would almost certainly have used δεσπότης and so avoided the ambiguity of κύριος.

A more important indication of the non-Christian origin of the Haustafel is its irrelevance to mixed households. The situation of believing wives married to pagan husbands and Christian slaves belonging to pagan owners could be acute because the wife and the slave were unable as Christians to participate in the pagan worship of their husbands and owners. Pagan husbands and slave owners would have had no objection to their wives and slaves adding another god or goddess to those already worshipped in the household so long as no claim to exclusiveness was made; this was a claim Christians

could not escape making (see the quotation above from Plutarch and the reference to Justin Martyr). Probably the writers of Colossians and Ephesians (they may not have been the same) incorporated the Haustafel without realising that it applied only to a limited group of wholly Christian households. None of the sections in the Haustafel would have been out of accord with Hellenistic ethical thinking. Although no similarly structured Haustafel can be found in the Greco-Roman world, from the time of Aristotle household management was divided into the three areas of master and slave, parent and child, husband and wife (*Politics* 1259A). We find this division continued and developed in Hellenism (Seneca, *Ep.* 94.1-3; Stobaeus [Hense] IV 27.20); Epictetus stresses the second and third areas (e.g. 2.17.3; 3.7.26; he may have omitted the reference to slavery because he had once been a slave.

We also find the same three areas of ethical conduct being treated in Hellenistic Judaism; the clearest example is Pseudo-Phocylides 195-227 who deals with each area (see also Josephus, *c.Apionem* 2.189-214; Philo, *Posteritate Caini* 181).

Christians would have been the more inclined to adopt the type of teaching contained in the Haustafel if it had reached them through Judaism and not directly from the pagan world; it is indeed even possible that the form of the Haustafel in Ephesians and Colossians originated in Judaism. But if its origin lay in Hellenism there would have been no difficulty in its being transmitted through Judaism. Jews were expected to marry Jews (see below) so that unmixed households were the normal situation among them. The problems raised by mixed marriages would not then have been as serious for them as they became for Christians. Apart from the emphasis in Jewish teaching on Jews marrying Jews, Jews in the Diaspora tended to live in Jewish communities and would marry within their communities. Christianity however was something new and the Christian groups were small; there was no natural pool of Christian women already in existence from which Christian men could choose their wives or women their husbands. There always had to be a first to be converted out of any existing pagan household and, unless it was the husband who might be able to insist on his family and slaves being baptised, the one who had been converted

might remain for a lengthy period, if not for ever, the only Christian in the household.

The emphasis on unmixed households in Judaism goes back at least as far as Ezra who forbade mixed marriages and instructed those who had already entered into them to break them off (9.10ff; 10.1ff; 10.18ff; cf. Tob. 4.12; *T. Levi* 9.9f; Pseudo-Philo, *LAB* 9.5, where incest is regarded as preferable to sexual intercourse with a non-Jew). There were of course Jewish wives, like Esther, who married non-Jews. But in the additions made to her story in the LXX it is said that she had not eaten at Haman's table and had not honoured the king's feast or drunk his wine (4.17 ; cf Josephus, Ant. xviii.81-84; xx.139); in that way her purity in terms of the law was preserved. In the story of Joseph and Aseneth, Joseph does not have sexual intercourse with Aseneth while she is non-Jewish (8.5) and it is only after her conversion to Judaism that he marries her (18.1ff). Thus attempts were made to preserve the totally Jewish nature of Jewish households and to account for those that were seemingly not so. The Mishnah (*Kidd.* 4.3) carries on the ideal of no mixed marriages; yet at times they must have occurred and Yeb 2.5; 7.5; 8.3 attempt to say what should happen in these rare cases.

Clearly the case of children would cause no difficulty since children born in a Jewish home would be brought up as Jews. But what of slaves in a Jewish household? In the Old Testament a distinction is drawn between slaves who were Jewish and those who were not. Only the former could expect to have their freedom granted as of right. Naturally their presence in the household would cause no problems for they would automatically accept Jewish law. But what of non-Jewish slaves? Gen. 17.12f implies they were, if male, to be circumcised; if they refused, then owners were expected to sell them within the year. Such non-Jewish slaves were also bound to keep certain Jewish religious customs, though like women and children they were exempt from others. Through their fulfilment of some of the Jewish law they did not render the household unclean

and therefore they could be retained in it and Jewish members of the household could eat the food they prepared. [1]

There would thus be no objection to the origin of the Ephesian and Colossian form of the Haustafel within Judaism, and still less, if its origin lay in the Greco-Roman world, for it to have reached Christianity through Judaism. In favour of the former is the qualification to κύριοι in 6.5; Jews like Christians would probably have avoided this word with its ambiguity.

As we have seen the Haustafel in 1 Pet 2.13-3.7 differs considerably from those of Ephesians and Colossians. It adds a section on the attitude of the citizen to the state, omits the section on children and parents and treats the mixed household rather than the unmixed; it is therefore unlikely that it is either a development of the form in Ephesians and Colossians or that the form in the two latter epistles was developed from it. Its additional section on the Christian and the civil authorities continues earlier Christian teaching on this subject in Mark 12.13-17 and Rom. 13.1-7, and is in line with the concern that prayers should be offered for rulers (1 Tim. 2.1f). As a whole the Petrine Haustafel resembles Tit. 2.1-10; 3.1, [2] though not strictly parallel in all its sections to the latter. Because the Petrine form treats the mixed household rather than the unmixed it makes a more realistic approach to actual living. The existence of the Petrine form means that two forms of the Haustafel were current in early Christianity and implies its importance in post-baptismal catechetical instruction (none of the conversion stories in Acts shows any sign of pre-baptismal instruction). Traces of the influence of the Haustafel form of instruction are to be found in the Apostolic Fathers, where there may be a mingling of the two forms: 1 Clem. 1.3; 21.6-9; Didache 4.9-11; Ignatius, *Polycarp* 4.1-6.1; Polycarp, *Philippians*

---

[1]   See G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Cambridge Mas, 1932, II, pp. 18f, 135f; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, London, 1961, pp. 85f; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, (2nd edn, ed G. Vermes, F. Miller, M. Black), vol II, Edinburgh, 1979, pp., 420f, 452, 482.

[2]   See H. Von Lips, 'Die Haustafel als "Topos" im Rahmen der urchristlichen Paränese: Beobachtungen anhand des 1. Petrusbriefes und des Titusbriefes', *NTS* 40 (1994) 261-280.

4.2-6.1. Other areas of living are introduced in these post New Testament writings, e.g. widows, bishops. Ministers, though not specifically bishops, had been referred to earlier in 1 Pet. 5.1-5 and this section may originally have been part of the Haustafel used there.

We return finally to the Haustafel of Ephesians in order to draw some conclusions as to its adequacy for Christian instruction. It fulfils its purpose in giving reliable and truthful advice for those who live in wholly Christian households, provided we realise its regulations apply to its own period and not ours. It cannot be seen as other than inadequate, even in its own time, for the pastoral counselling of believers who do not live in wholly Christian homes; these would include those who had obeyed the call of Jesus and left home and kinsfolk to follow him, widows (the care of whom features prominently in other parts of the NT, Acts 6.1-6; 1 Cor. 7.39f; 1 Tim. 5.3-16; Jas. 1.27), divorced people (probably women expelled from their homes because they had adopted the silly superstition of Christianity). It is not a sufficient response to the inadequacy of its counselling to say that the Haustafel in Ephesians presents an ideal for it has not advice to give on how to move from the ideal to the real situation nor does it even suggest that it is necessary so to move. It has moreover no advice for slaves who have been freed and, in accordance with the custom of the time, remained in some kind of relation with their original owner; it must also have left slave wives in the awkward position of not knowing when they should obey their husbands and when their owners if a clash of direction should arise.

All these objections to the adequacy of the Haustafel in Ephesians apply equally to that in Colossians. The Ephesian form has however one important feature lacking in Colossians: the author of Ephesians receiving it in the tradition realised that he could use it to good effect not only in his moral instruction of believers but also in his other main subject, his teaching about the church. Taking up a theme of the Old Testament, the marriage of Yahweh and Israel, and perhaps also the pagan myth of the holy marriage, he uses his marital instruction to develop his ideas on the church. In doing so he replaces Yahweh with Christ and Israel with the church. It is unnecessary to follow out the details of his teaching but in essence he

shows that the church would not have come into being but for the self-sacrificing love of Christ and that its continued existence depends on the care and affection he bestows on it as well as the nurture he provides for it. As far as believers go this enables him to argue for the obedience of the church to Christ. In an odd way this all follows from the fact of the Haustafel's restriction to wholly Christian households. If the husband had been an unbeliever he could not have represented Christ; if the wife had been an unbeliever she could not have represented the church. Generally in the Old Testament the marital imagery is used in respect of a disbelieving and disobedient Israel whom God has wooed and continues to woo. The author of Ephesians seized the opportunity which the picture of the believing household offered him and used it to develop his teaching on the church to which he had earlier devoted a large portion of his letter. Whether he actually realised the ethical inadequacy of the Haustafel is another matter; it looks as if he did not, otherwise he would have modified its two other sections. Those who had earlier introduced the Haustafel into Christian teaching from Judaism, or from paganism, clearly did not see its limitations nor did the author of Colossians. But the author of Ephesians succeeded in turning to good account its restrictive nature in a way he could never have done with the Petrine form of the Haustafel.

E. Best

Bibliography

M. Dibelius, *An die Kolosser Epheser, an Philemon* (ed H. Greeven), Tübingen, pp.48-50; K. Weidinger, *Die Haustafeln, ein Stück urchristlichen Paraenese*, UNT 14, Leipzig, 1928; E.G Selwyn, *The First Epistle of Peter*, London, 1947, pp.419-39; K.H. Rengstorf, 'Die neutestamentliche Mahnungen an die Frau, sich den Manne unterzuordnen', *Verborum Dei in Aeternum* (FS O. Schmitz, ed W. Foerster), Witten, 1953, pp.131-45; H.D. Wendland, 'Zur sozialethischen Bedeutung der neutestamentlichen Haustafeln'. *Die Leibhaftigkeit des Wortes* (FS A. Koberle, ed O Michel and U.

Mann), Hamburg, 1958, pp.34-56; D. Schroeder, *Die Haustafeln des Neuens Testaments* (unpublished dissertation) Hamburg, 1959; O. Merk, *Handeln aus Glauben*, Marburg, 1968, pp.214-24; J.P. Sampley, *'And the Two Shall Become One Flesh'* (SNTSMS 16), Cambridge, 1971, pp.17-30; J.E. Crouch, *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel*, FRLANT 109, Göttingen, 1972; W. Schrage, 'Zur Ethik der neutestamentlichen Haustafeln', *NTS* 21 (1974/5) 1-22; D. Lührmann, 'Neutestamentliche Haustafeln und antike Ökonomie', *WD* 13 (1975) 53-83; E. Schweizer, 'Die Weltlichkeit des Neuens Testaments: die Haustafeln', *Beiträge zur Alttestamentliche Theologie* (FS W. Zimmerli, ed H. Donner, R. Hanhart, R. Smend), Gottingen, 1977, pp.396-413; L. Goppelt, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, KEK, Göttingen, 1978, pp.163-79; R.P. Martin, *NIDNTT*, III pp.928-32; E. Schweizer, 'Traditional ethical patterns in the Pauline and post-Pauline letters and their developoment', *Text and Interpretation* (FS M. Black, ed E.Best and R. McL. Wilson), Cambridge, 1979, pp.195-209; F. Stagg, 'The Domestic Code and Final Appeal in Ephesians 5:21-6:24', *RevExp* 76 (1979) 541-52; D.L. Balch, *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter* (SBLMS 26), Chico, CA, 1981; K. Thaede, 'Zur historischen Hintergrund der "Haustafeln" des NT', *Pietas* (FS B.Kötting, ed E.Dassmann and K.S. Frank, JAC Ergänzungsband 8), Münster Westfallen, 1980, pp.259-68; J. Gnilka, *Der Kolosserbrief*, HTKNT, Freiburg, Basel, Wien, 1980, pp.205-216; D. Lthrmann, 'Neutestamentliche Haustafeln und antike Okonomie', *NTS* 27 (1980/1) 83-97; K. Mtller 'Die Haustafel des Kolosserbriefes und das antike Frauenthema. Eine kritische Rückschau auf alter Ergebnisse', *Die Frau im Urchristentum* (ed. G. Dautzenberg, H. Merklein, K. Müller), Freiberg, Basel, Wien, 1982, pp.263-319; J.H. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, London, 1982, pp.204-220; G.E. Cannon, *The Use of Traditional Materials in Colossians*, Macon GA, 1983, pp.95-131; D.C. Verner, *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles* (SBLDS 71), Chico, CA, 1983; A.S. di Marco, 'Ef 5,21-6,9', *RivB* 31 (1983) 189-207; K. Berger, *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*, Heidelberg, 1984, pp.135-41, and *ANRW*, 1984, II 25, pp.1078-86; P. Fiedler, *RAC*, XIII, pp.1063-73; L. Hartmann, 'Code and Context: A Few

Reflections on the Paraenesis of Col 3:6-4:1'. *Tradition and Interpretation of the New Testament* (FS E.E. Ellis, ed G.F. Hawthorne and O. Betz). Tübingen. 1987. pp.237-47: P. Pokorny, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Kolosser*, TKNT, Berlin. 1987. pp.149-52: B. Witherington. *Women in the Earliest Churches* (SNTSMS 59). Cambridge. 1988. pp.42-61: M.Y. Macdonald, *The Pauline Churches* (SNTSMS 60). Cambridge. 1988. pp.102-22: G. Strecker. 'Die neutestamentlichen Haustafeln', (Kol 3,18-4,1 und Eph 5,22-6.9) in *Neues Testament und Ethik* (FS R. Schnackenburg. ed. H. Merklein). 1989. pp.349-75: S. Moyter, 'The Relationship between Paul's Gospel of "All one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3.28) and the "Household Codes"', *VoxEv* 19 (1989) 33-48: H. Gielen, *Tradition und Theologie neutestamentlicher Haustafelethik*. Frankfort am Main, 1990: H. von Lips. 'Die Haustafel als "Topos" im Rahmen der urchristlichen Paränese und des Titusbriefes', *NTS* 40 (1994) 361-80: M. Theobald. 'Heilige Hochzeit'. *Metaphorik und Mythos im Neuen Testament* (ed. K. Kertelge. Questiones Disputatae. 126). Herder. Freiburg. Basel, Wien, 1990. pp.220-54.

THE HEALING OF THE LEPER: THE ACCOUNTS IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND PAPYRUS EGERTON 2, PAPYRUS KÖLN 255

Carol Kellas

The account of the healing of the leper in the three synoptic gospels, Matt 8:1-4, Mark 1:40-45, Luke 5:12-16, shows a common core of words which are identical or near identical, together with a complicated set of inter-relationships between the remaining words. In analysing these accounts scholars mainly argue either for the priority of Mark (those following the two-document hypothesis) or see Mark as a conflation of Matthew and Luke (those following the two-gospel hypothesis). There are other hypotheses, but it is unusual to find one which proposes that there is no simple direct relationship between the accounts in their final forms in Matthew, Mark and Luke. However, in a recent article O'Neill has argued that this is indeed the case because it is unlikely that the lost written records were in Greek or that scribes altered, selected or changed the sacred traditions of Jesus deliberately.[1]

An analysis of the texts of this particular pericope lends support to this last hypothesis, and the case is reinforced when the account of the healing of the leper in Papyrus Egerton 2 and papyrus Köln 255 is placed alongside the three canonical Gospels as a fourth column. The same complicated set of relationships appears, with a slightly reduced core of identical or near identical words which make up the skeleton of the story.

I wish to argue that this core has passed through separate traditions and that the inter-relationships of the synoptic accounts are explained neither by the priority of Mark nor by the direct dependence of one gospel on one or two of the others. Further, that the account in Papyrus Egerton 2 and Papyrus Köln 255 is neither an

---

[1] J.C. O'Neill, 'The Lost Written Records of Jesus' Words and Deeds behind our Records', *JTS* n.s. 42 (1991) 483-504.

archaic form of the synoptic account nor dependent on one or more
of the canonical gospels but is representative of the way the tradition
has been handed down in a different environment.

The account of the healing of the leper in Papyrus Egerton 2,
fragment 2 recto, is one of five pericopes contained in the four extant
fragments. Bell and Skeat[2] render the visible letters of this pericope,
with contractions in round brackets and conjectures for the missing
letters in square brackets, thus:

32   και [ι]δου λεπρος προσελθ[ων αυτω]
           λεγει διδασκαλε Ιη(σου) λε[προις συν-]
           οδευων και συνεσθιω[ν αυτοις]

35   εν τω πανδοχειω ελ[επρησα]
           και αυτος εγω εαν [ο]υν [συ θελης]
           καθαριζομαι ο δη κ(υριο)ς [εφη αυτω]

38   θελ[ω] καθαρισθητι [και ευθεως]
           [α]πεστη απ αυτου η λεπ[ρα ο δε κ(υριο)ς]
           [ειπεν αυτω] πορε[υθεις επιδει-]

41   [ζον σεαυτο]ν τοι[ς ιερευσι]

As this account contains no command to make an offering,
as laid down by Moses, it could be seen as an earlier shorter version
of the healing of the leper. However Papyrus Köln 255 has been
identified as the missing part of Papyrus Egerton, fragment 2, which
finishes the story in the same way as the synoptic gospels.
Gronewald's setting down of the visible letters with his
reconstruction and new numbering[3] incorporates lines 39 to 41 of
Bell and Skeat. It reads thus:

---

2   H.I. Bell and T.C. Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel*
      (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1935).

3   M. Gronewald, 'Unbekanntes Evangelium oder
      Evangelienharmonie (Fragment aus dem "Evangelium
      Egerton")', Kö lner Papyri (P. Ko ln) Band 6, Papyrologia
      Coloniensia (Abh. RWA Sonderreihe, VII; Opladen: Cologne,
      1987) 136-145 at 140.

42 (39) [α]πεστη απ αυτου η λεπ[ρα λεγει]
δε αυτω ο Ιησ(ους) [ ] πορε[υθεις σεαυ-]

44 (41) τον επιδειξον τοι[ς ιερευσιν]
και ανενεγκον [περι του κα-]

46 (-) [θ]αρισμου ως προ[σ]ε[ταξεν Μω(υσης) και]
[μ]ηκετι α[μα]ρτανε

Papyrus Egerton 2 may well date from the middle of the second century AD or even earlier according to Bell and Skeat.[4] It has been assessed as nearer the end rather than the middle of the second century[5] but even if this second dating is correct it is still estimated to be one of the five earliest extant Christian writings.[6]

The assessment of its relationship to the synoptic gospels is, not surprisingly, varied. . Mayeda, who wrote a dissertation on the Papyrus in 1946, argued that the Papyrus represented a private gospel written independently of the canonical gospels.[7] Koester says that it represents a stage in the tradition that preceded the canonical gospels.[8] Cameron writes that Egerton 2 shows no dependence on the gospels of the New Testament.[9] In his thesis, *The Egerton Gospel: Its Place in Early Christianity*, Daniels supports this view

---

[4]   Bell & Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel*, 1.

[5]   Gronewald, 'Unbekanntes Evangelium', 137.

[6]   E.G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977) 90.

[7]   G. Mayeda, *Das Leben-Jesu-Fragment Papyrus Egerton 2 und seine Stellung in der urchristlichen Literaturgeschichte* (Bern: Paul Haupt, 1946) esp. 65-77. See Helmut Koester, 'Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels', *HTR* 73 (1980) 119.

[8]   Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament, Vol 2, History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1980; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) 182; *Ancient Christian Gospel: Their History and Development* (London: SCM, 1990) 205-216; 'The Healing of a Leper', 211-213.

[9]   R. Cameron, *The Other Gospels* (Guildford: Lutterworth, 1983) 73.

and suggests that the account of the healing of the leper plausibly represents a separate tradition.[10]

However Jeremias takes a different view and concludes that the 'juxtaposition of Johannine and Synoptic material and the fact that the Johannine material is shot through with Synoptic phrases and the Synoptic with Johannine usage, permits the conjecture that the author knew all and every one of the canonical Gospels'.[11] Neirynck declares that the weight of scholarship sees a connection between Egerton 2 and the canonical gospels and says himself that the writer had an acquaintance with all the gospels but certainly with Luke.[12] Neirynck and Boismard have discussed this question in *The Interrelations of the Gospels*[13] where Neirynck is attempting to refute the theory of Boismard who sees the account of the healing of the leper in Papyrus Egerton 2 as preserved in a more primitive form than the synoptic accounts. Boismard's findings accord with his 'Niveaux multiples' hypothesis and Neirynck's with the priority of Mark.

To begin with I wish to examine the four accounts of the healing of the leper in terms of context, order, exact word similarity, near similarity and differences.

Firstly, the context of each. In Matthew the story is placed after the teaching on the mountain when Jesus has descended. The crowds are astonished at his teaching and its authority and if a

---

10   J.B. Daniels, *The Egerton Gospel: Its Place in Early Christianity* (Dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California, 1989). See a report in H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 206-207.

11   Joachim Jeremias, 'An Unknown Gospel with Johannine Elements', *New Testament Apycropha*, Vol 1, ed. W. Schneemelcher (London: Lutterworth, 1963) 95.

12   F. Neirynck, 'Papyrus Egerton 2 and the Healing of the Leper', *EThL* 61 (1985) 153-160.

13   F. Neirynck. 'The Healing of the Leper', *The Interrelations of the Gospels* ed. D. Dungan, (BETL XCV, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990) 94-107; Boismard, M.-E., 'La guérison de lépreux, *The Interrelations of the Gospels*, 254-258.

sequence is assumed they are still with him when the leper approaches him.

In Mark the context is different. Jesus has been in a lonely place, apparently pursued by the crowds and saying that he must move on to preach, so he went 'throughout all Galilee preaching in their synagogues and casting out demons' (1:39).

In Luke the pericope follows the call of the four fishermen disciples and the location is 'one of the cities'.

In Papyrus Egerton 2 the story of the leper follows straight on from a passage in which the rulers sought to lay hands on Jesus but could not because his hour of betrayal had not yet come and o κ(υριο)ς εξελθων [δια μεσου αυ]των απενευσεν απ [αυτων] (Lines 30-31). This episode closes and the story of the leper begins without any comment.

In Mark and Luke and Papyrus Egerton 2 it is quite clear that there is no necessary connection with the preceding verses. All move into the story of the leper without any words which seek to make a link with the preceding pericope. It is quite straightforward to see here the account of the healing of the leper as an independent story. In Matthew superficially there is a connection in that the incident is placed after the descent from the mountain and joined with a καί. However, the mountain provided the context for Jesus teaching the people; a mountain was peculiarly suitable with its overtones of theophany and Moses at Sinai. Going up and coming down a mountain would appear to be a clear literary device and in no way connected with following events. Further, the crowds are said to have descended with Jesus and thus logically would have been present at the healing of the leper but Jesus says, 'See that you say nothing to anyone', a rather strange order in view of the accompanying crowds..

The conclusion is that here, as in Luke and Mark and in Egerton 2, the pericope is isolated and it seems most likely that it was originally a story without a specific location.

In Matthew the healing of the leper is the first of a series of healings including the Centurion's boy, Peter's mother-in-law and many who were possessed by demons. In Mark and Luke it is followed by the healing of the paralysed man. The larger unit in all

three canonical gospels is concerned with healings. In Papyrus
Egerton 2 the story is not part of a healing collection. It could well
be an example of an early stage when the sayings and deeds of Jesus
were being gathered together and simply laid side by side. The
Egerton 2 fragments have been called an 'unknown gospel' by Bell
and Skeat and others who have commented on the fragments but with
so few fragments it is hardly possible to surmise that they necessarily
formed part of a whole gospel in our understanding of the term.
They may have formed one of many smaller collections of the words
and deeds of Jesus.

On the question of order, in the wider context, there is no
clear pattern which emerges. In all three canonical gospels these
healing collections occur early in the gospels. Luke has a block
which begins with the healing of the leper, 5:12 to 6:17, which is
similar to Mark 1:40 to 3:13, but Matthew has different material. As
the healing of the leper has come in at least two different healing
collections, so these themselves are part of different larger
collections. In Papyrus Egerton 2 there is not enough text to
evaluate its position in a wider context.

The superficial similarities of the text of the three canonical
gospels and Egerton 2 can be deceptive, for within this pericope of
the healing of the leper there is not only a common core but there are
also significant and numerous differences.

To begin with there is a considerable difference on a simple
word count. The text used for the comparisons is Aland's *Synopsis
of the Four Gospels*, German Bible Society, Stuttgart, Eighth
corrected Edition. Matthew, the shortest of the synoptic accounts,
has 63 words, Luke has 98, Mark has 99 and Papyrus Egerton 2 (for
the following purposes this also includes Papyrus Köln 255) has 62.

Matthew, Mark, Luke and Egerton 2 have 19 words in
common. In the case of five there are variants in Egerton 2: λέγει
instead of λέγων, καθαρίζομαι instead of καθαρίσαι, ἐπίδειξον as
opposed to δεῖξον, ἄνενεγκον instead of προσένεγκε, and priests in
the plural instead of the singular. It should be noted however that a
sizeable number of versions witness to priests in the plural in Luke's
account (b ff² syˢ syᵖ Persian Diatessaron Clem Alex Aug Harm
Gosp 2.40 Ephrem Comm 12:23,24 Ev 95). One further difference

is that Mark has εὐθύς and Matthew, Luke and Egerton 2 have εὐθέως.

Matthew, Mark and Luke have a further fourteen words in common which are identical in order, apart from ἥψατο αὐτοῦ which is reversed in Mark.

Mark, Luke and Egerton 2 have two phrases in common. In the first, ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, Egerton has different verb ἀπέστη (line 39). The second phrase, περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ, is identical.

Matthew and Mark also have six words in common: ἐκαθαρίσθη, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὅρα, and ὕπαγε.

Matthew, Luke and Egerton 2 all introduce the leper with ἰδού and Matthew, Mark and Egerton all describe the man as λεπρός. However, λεπρός is also used in Luke in Codex Bezae, the Old Latin version d, the Arabic Diatessaron and Marcion.

There are three instances where two accounts share one identical word: Matthew and Egerton 2 have προσελθών describing the action of the leper in approaching Jesus; Matthew and Luke have the leper addressing Jesus as κύριε; and Mark and Luke have σου following περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ. In addition Luke has καθὼς and Egerton 2 has ὡς introducing προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς.

The remainder of the central part of the story which is different in each account amounts to 7 words in Matthew (plus verse 1); 23 in Mark (plus verses 1a and 45); 17 in Luke (plus verses 15 and 16); and 29 words in Egerton 2.

All the arguments that are used to show Mark as the gospel Luke and Matthew used could in this case be used to show Matthean priority. Matthew not only has the shortest text but also has more in common with Mark and Luke than they have with each other.

The words which are exactly the same, almost identical or in different tenses, form the main core of the story. There is a clear outline of an incident:

> A leper said,
> 'If you wish, I can be cleansed'.
> He said,
> 'I do wish. Be cleansed.'
> Immediately the leprosy left him.

> He said,
> Go and show yourself to the priest
> and give the offering laid down by
> Moses'.

This outline can account for variations of expression in each of the versions. For example the presence of 'If you wish, you are able to cleanse me' in the canonical gospels and 'If you wish, I am cleansed' in Egerton 2 could well easily be two ways of expressing, in Greek, the same original in Hebrew or Aramaic. Likewise the different ways of describing the healing: ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα in Matthew; ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα in Mark; ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ in Luke and ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα in Egerton 2 are close enough to be four translations; likewise the variations in Jesus' instructions to the leper to go to the priest(s) could derive from an original account.

In the next stage this core material has moved in at least two directions. One is that which has developed into Egerton 2. Firstly, there is a description of how the leper approached Jesus. Secondly, there is an expansion which explains how the man became a leper. Thirdly, there are three connecting phrases introducing the words of the leper and the two sets of the words of Jesus. Fourthly, there is the extension of the order to go to the priests when Jesus says, 'and sin no more'. It is easy to see how these may have joined the core to bring Egerton 2 into its present form, whether in one or several stages. The Johannine overtones of the last phrase do not suggest that the scribe had any or all of John's gospel before him and had picked out a phrase to round off this story (John 5.14; [8.11]); rather this looks like part of the tradition which has come from a source (cf. Matt 12.45; Heb 6.4-8; 10.26; 2 Pet·2.20-22).

The core material, which is common to all four accounts, has been extended in the tradition which has fed into the canonical gospels. The words of the leper have been expanded to become:
'If you wish, you are able to cleanse me'.
The words of Jesus have been extended to include the comment:
Stretching out his hand he touched him.
Preceding Jesus' instruction to go to the priest is the warning:

> See that you say nothing to anyone.

The offering to Moses is said to be:

> as a witness to them.

All this further material common to the canonical gospels is thus the next stage of the transmission. It is not essential, for the account stands without them. The phrases are expansions and extensions which would have followed quite naturally. This new core has, like Egerton 2 at an earlier stage, separated and moved in different directions. As the story has become part of the Jesus tradition of different communities, so it has developed in a way that produced similar but distinct forms.

For example, in each of the canonical gospels there are descriptions of how the man approached Jesus, which have nothing in common. Mark's account has the additional information that Jesus was moved with pity, and has a description of the manner of Jesus, sending the healed leper away, as well as an emphatic 'to anyone', added to the order to say nothing. As we have seen, some of the material outside of the core is common to Matthew and Luke and some is common to Matthew and Mark. Both Mark and Luke have additional lines which complete the story whereas Matthew finishes with the common material.

To sum up: in these pericopes there is material common to the canonical gospels and Egerton 2; there is further material common to the canonical gospels alone; each account then has other material which is unique, but also words and phrases which are identical in two or three of the four accounts.

All these complications exist simply within the one text of Aland's *Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, which has been used for this purpose. There is a vast number of other possibilities within the different manuscripts of the canonical gospels. There are over 30 variant readings for this pericope in Matthew and Mark and over 60 for Luke. This suggests a much more complicated process of transmission than is apparent when working on a single text. Elliott[14] has pointed out the importance of taking variant readings

---

14   J. K. Elliott, 'Printed Editions of Greek Synopses and their influence on the Synoptic Problem', *The Four Gospels:*

into account and says that 'decisions about the Synoptic Problem ought not to be made on the basis of the text in any one Synopsis but ... one should make use of the alternative readings to be found in the critical apparatus and ... one should not imbue the editor of any one printed text with an omniscience that enabled him to produce a definitive version of the text'.

There are variant readings of the words and phrases which are common to Matthew, Mark and Luke in Aland's text. Underneath the harmony there is discord lurking. It is not always of great significance but it is always a reminder of earlier stages where the texts of the gospels may have differed from one another far more widely than is shown by modern attempts to construct a 'standard' text. Take, for example, the phrase σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ which is identical in Matthew, Mark and Luke in Aland's text, except that Luke has δεῖξον before σεαυτόν. The different order of these two words is also found in Matthew's text in 1396 and in Mark's text in the Washington Codex. Furthermore, Luke has σεαυτῷ in Γ and 69. The words τῷ ἱερεῖ are varied in readings to be found in all three gospels. The reading ἀρχιερεῖ for ἱερεῖ is found in Mark (fam 13 [excl. 124] 33) and Luke (047). In Luke, as has been noted, τοῖς ἱεροῦσιν is another variant. This plural form exists also in one Syriac version of Matthew (sy[c]). In Luke τῷ is omitted in 1604 and the whole phrase δεῖξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ καί is omitted in Codex Sinaiticus*.

The traditional solutions to the Synoptic Problem that there is one original account used by the other two, or that one or more of the accounts is dependent on one or more of the others do not square easily with this evidence.

There is undoubtedly a large amount of identical material. There is also some similar material which can be fairly easily explained, such as εὐθύς in Mark and εὐθέως in Matthew, Luke and Egerton 2. However, if this is a straight copy, why are there so many internal variations, identical words between Mark, Luke and

Egerton 2; Mark and Matthew; Luke, Matthew and Egerton 2; Mark, Matthew and Egerton 2; Matthew and Egerton 2; Luke and Egerton 2; Mark and Luke; and Matthew and Luke? This represents almost every conceivable variation, and when all the evidence of other manuscripts is added in, the picture is even more complicated. Why should there be such picking and choosing? The problem of the variety between the accounts seems to outweigh the problem of the identical material. It would be a tortuous business to show that Luke and Mark had used Matthew or that Matthew and Luke had used Mark. Egerton 2 has material in common with all the synoptic gospels as well as its own distinctive additions and variations, suggesting that it is likely to be an independent account rather than an account dependent on any or all of the three gospels.

There has to be an explanation which accounts for the identical, similar and different words and phrases. In the oral tradition the core words must have been sufficiently significant to be remembered and handed on in a similar form. It is unlikely that such a large section of common material could have come into four different collections in the same words by chance. It is much more likely that this points to an important and well known tradition which was carefully passed on.

As the tradition came to be written down these were the main words and, as the tradition developed, they became embedded in different settings. In the development from the oral tradition to written records these words have retained their importance but their total identity has been lost as they developed in different communities. Small changes such as Matthew and Luke having κύριε would make sense as the basic plot is developed into story form. The major differences in the additional material at the beginning in Egerton 2 and the end in Mark and Luke do not disturb the integrity of the main part of the account.

A possible explanation for this core's remaining intact is that these words were used in ritual by the early Christians for healing, and that this story was a paradigm. Words used in such a context are most likely to stay in an identical form with only minor changes. This story is perhaps not just a simple healing. Lepers, like the blind and the dumb, seem to have some symbolic significance. The other

two main references to lepers in Matthew are used in this way. In Jesus' instructions to his disciples he says, 'Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers, cast out demons' (10:8). When John asks whether Jesus is the one who is to come the answer of Jesus is, 'Go and tell John what you hear and see, the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news preached to them' (11:4-5). Clearly leprosy, even if it included many skin complaints, was only one of what must have been many diseases, yet it is singled out in this way. The verb καθαρίζω suggests ritual purity as signified in the rules in Lev 13 and 14. The fact that the best part of these two chapters of Leviticus is employed to explain the rules for purification of those with skin diseases underlines the significance of this kind of ritual impurity. Behind these four accounts of the healing of the leper there may be a liturgical use of the words which form the core of the story.

The only other reference to the healing of lepers in the synoptic gospels is in Luke in the cleansing of the ten lepers (Lk 17:11-14). The points of contact are not many. There is no conversation about Jesus being able to cleanse the lepers nor any mention of hand contact. There is a reference to going to the priests, without a reason being given. Here it is priests, as in Papyrus Köln 255, rather than priest of the earlier account and of Matthew and Mark. However, it has already been noted that there are readings in Luke's first account which also have 'priests'. The significance of the difference between singular and plural should not be over-emphasised. There may be a very simple explanation which relates to the background. The singular reference may be because there was one priest at a sanctuary as opposed to several priests at another which accounts for the plural. Or it may be that there were several priests but only one was needed to certify the cure, in which case either the singular or the plural would be appropriate and might explain why the action is to be a witness to αὐτοῖς in the synoptic accounts. Luke's account of the ten lepers suggests that there were other stories of lepers being healed but this does not affect the conclusions concerning the four accounts of the healing of the one leper.

Papyrus Egerton 2 and Papyrus Köln 255 offer a rare opportunity to examine a pericope from the canonical gospels in a wider context. The normal method of procedure in assessing the evidence of the synoptic gospels is given a new dimension when this fourth source is placed alongside Matthew, Mark and Luke. What emerges is four accounts of a healing where the words of the leper and of Jesus have been handed down in an almost identical form. In the process of transmission these treasured words have followed diverse paths and so in the form that we have them today they are found in similar words yet different settings.

Mrs Carol Kellas, a research student at the University of Edinburgh, died of cancer on 20 May 1994.

IN SEARCH OF THE ORIGIN OF THE DEUTERONOMIC MOVEMENT

Rev. Dr. Canon J. O. Akao

INTRODUCTION

For quite some time now the study of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic school has been an area of ferment in the field of the Old Testament. A lot of work has been done[1] but there seems to be no solution in sight to most of the questions usually raised. The authorship of the Book Deuteronomy has been as problematic as the right candidates to whom to ascribe the Deuteronomic traits in Old Testament literature. Difficult and nagging though the problem is, much weight continues to be accorded to Deuteronomism in Old Testament studies both in the compilation of the literature as well as the shaping of the Biblical faith.

As early as the Nineteenth Century, Baudissm and others [2] following after him have offered their well argued propositions for the right candidates for the Deuteronomic school. But, as normally happens in a controversial area of research, each proposition presented so far has shown itself to be defective in one point or another when subjected to serious scrutiny.

---

[1]   See among others; Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972; A.H.A. Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, New Century Bible. (Greenwood S.C. Attic Press, 1979), p.25-108; L.J. Hoppe, 'The Levitical Origins of Deuteronomy, Reconsidered' *Biblical Research*, 28, (1983), pp. 27-36; A.C. Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy, A New Theory of Its Origin*, (London, 1924).

[2]   W.W.F.G. Baudissm, *Geschichte des Alttestamentlichen Priestertums* (Leipzig Harzel, 1889; See also, Horst F. *Das Privilegrecht Jahres, Rechtsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen Zum Deuteronomium* (Frlan't F. xxviii). (Göttingen Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1930).

As a result Edward Nielsen[3] has described the subject in his
study of Deuteronomy, as one of the most peculiar phenomena in the
entire Old Testament Literature. This is because, in his view,
Deuteronomism in the Old Testament has its own characteristic
language, style and phraseology which makes it particularly peculiar.
In his own contribution, Eichrodt [4] has labelled it a document
without father, mother, and without genealogy. According to him,
this is due to the sudden way it made its appearance in the history of
Israel.

Bewildering though the subject appears to be, scholars like
Burney, Welch and Bentzen [5] among others have claimed
categorically that the group responsible for Old Testament
Deuteronomism should be sought among the clerical circle of the
Northern Kingdom. These clerics, they claim, inaugurated their
work in the Northern kingdom and perfected it at Jerusalem after the
Syrian conquest of Samária in 721 B.C. According to them, the
distinctive traits exhibited by Old Testament Deuteronomism[6] in
areas of language, style and special interests, support the view that it
emanated from the priestly circle.

But Nicholson [7] and others have contested this with their
own suggestion that the circle of the prophets should be seen as the

---

3   E. Nielsen, *Shechem: A Traditio-historical Investigation*,
        (Copenhagen, 1955) p. 344.
4   W. Eichrodt. *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 3, (1921), p.14.
5   A.C. Welch. *The Code of Deuteronomy: A New Theory of Its
        Origin*, London, 1924, pp. 206 ff. Cf. Burney, *Commentary on
        the Book of Judges*, London, 1918, p. XLVI; A. Bentzen, *Die
        Josianische Reform und Ihre Voraussetzungen*, Copenhagen,
        1926
6   Here we are referring to the Deuteronomism found in the
        Pentateuch and in the books of Samuel and Kings. It embraces
        the deuteronomic document found in the Temple in 621 B.C; the
        book Deuteronomy and other Old Testament Deuteronomic
        passages. See E.W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition*.
        Oxford, 1967, p.113 ff.
7   See A.D.H. Mayes, *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, (Oliphants,
        1979) p.103. And for a discussion on the very close affinities in

likely authors. The prophetic structures and the general critical attitude to the religious and secular institutions of Israel found in the prophets, they claim, inform the contents of the Deuteronomic literature.[8]

In reaction to this, however, Gerhard Von Rad has said that the prophetic elements or traits found, for instance, in Deuteronomy should rather be credited to the general religious tenor of the period of writing than to any specific and direct part played by the prophets in its production.

While opinions are hardly agreed on the authorship of Old Testament Deuteronomism, some scholars have tried to hazard a likely date when it made its appearance in Israelite literature. On this, there have been as many suggestions as there are scholars writing on the subject. As a result, we find that Old Testament Deuteronomism has been dated from the Mosaic to the post-exilic period and that no consensus has been reached. It is in the light of the foregoing that the phenomenon called Deuteronomism in Old Testament Literature makes itself an ever fresh and attractive subject for scholarly endeavour or investigation.

In this presentation, we want to concern ourselves with the socio-religious setting which we believe gave birth to the movement which metamorphosed into the Deuteronomic school in Israel. With our proposition, we hope to answer many of the questions which have not received adequate answers in the past.

PART 1

Our concern here will not be so much with the question of who wrote the book Deuteronomy and when it was written, — a debate that has engaged the attention of a lot of scholars, but rather how Deuteronomism arose in Israel and what were its roots.

---

idioms between Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, see Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), pp. 359-361 and W.L. Holladay, *JBL* 79, (1960), pp. 351-367.

[8] Here Deuteronomic Literature refers broadly to all the Old Testament Deuteronomic traits.

In order to provide the required basis for our discussion, we will first take a cursory look at suggested candidates for the authorship of Deuteronomy, pointing out in the process some of the points raised for or against them.

Baudissm in 1889 was the first to suggest priestly/levitical circles as possible authors of Deuteronomy. Others who followed in his trail developed his thesis adding their own modifications. Although some scholars have suggested groups[9] outside the priestly circle as likely authors, it seems that the majority of scholars are of the opinion that the circle of priests is the most likely candidate for the authorship. In this, a distinction has to be made between serving/Torah giving Levites and altar priests [10] and between Northern priests of Israel and Jerusalem based priests. Whichever of these groups one opts for, there will always be problems to face.

For instance, scholars who suggest Torah giving priests claim that Deuteronomy contains excellent examples of expository preaching and teaching which are the hall marks of the Levites in Israel. Instances which are cited from scriptures to buttress this point that the chief function of the Levites in the Old Testament was the work of teaching and exposition of Torah include Deut 33:10; II Chron 17:7-9; 35:3; Neh 8:7-9; Deut 27:9 etc.

But these client priests or country Levites[11] could not have been responsible for Deuteronomy which advocates centralisation of the cult. For the landless Levites to have been behind such a programme would have amounted to sawing off the branch on which they were sitting. This, however, has been defended by saying that the centralisation policy of Deuteronomy should be seen to belong to a much later layer of tradition.[12]

Horst and Clements believe that the Northern priests were responsible for the authorship but that they had their projects

---

9   See 7 above.
10   G.E. Wright, 'Deuteronomy', *IBZ* 325-326 and 'The Levites in Deuteronomy', *VT* 4, (1954), pp. 325-330.
11   G. von Rad. *Studies in Deuteronomy-* S.C.M., London, 1961, p.67.
12   Ibid, p.68.

completed at Jerusalem. While Horst actually holds that members of the Jerusalem based wisdom writers completed the project, Clements thinks that it was the same Northern priests who settled in Jerusalem after the 721 B.C. conquest of Israel that completed the writing. If this view of Northern provenance is upheld, then one has difficulty in explaining the observation made by Nicholson. [13]

According to him, the Jerusalem tradition concerning the special relationship between Yahweh and Mount Zion appears to have greatly influenced the Deuteronomist. The impact of this influence, he claims, appears to be the basis of his bitter polemic against the Northern Monarchy in setting up Bethel and Dan as rival sanctuaries to Jerusalem (I Kings 12:26; 13:1 ff II Kings 17:7 ff.; etc. cf I Kings 8:16, 44, 48; 11:13,82; 14:21; II Kings 21:7; 23:27).

The problem which this observation causes is that if the document is taken as coming from the pen of the priestly circle who until the eve of their displacement in 721 B.C. were officiates at the Northern sanctuaries, one finds it difficult to understand why they should be involved in a polemic against Bethel and Dan where they had been earning their livelihood as rival altars to Jerusalem.

In another dimension, however, some have seen Deuteronomy as a document of religious revival[14] offered by the Northern priesthood for the religious refurbishment of the Jerusalem Temple. But one wonders how this could have happened if for years the same priests faced with the idolatrous worship at Bethel and Dan did nothing to inject new life into them. It is in view of these and other associated problems that Hoppe [15] has found it difficult to accept Gerhard Von Rad's very illuminating thesis on the priestly authorship of Deuteronomy and so has instead opted for authorship by the Elders of Israel. He, however, fails to explain who these elders who had the responsibility of teaching the law actually were.

---

13   E.W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition*, Oxford, 1967, p.110 ft.

14   F. Dumermuth, 'Zur Deuterononischen Kulttheologie und ihren Voraussetzungen'. *ZAW* 70, (1958), pp. 59-98.

15   Leslie J. Hoppe. 'The Levitical Origin of Deuteronomy Reconsidered'. *Biblical Research*, 28, (1983), pp. 27-36.

This is because the Biblical tradition has it that the priests were the custodians and preachers of the law as they were the ones to whom Moses purportedly handed it over after writing, (Deut 31:9; 31:24-26; 17:18-19; cf Jer 5:31,28; 18:18; Neh 8:13).

The above serves to show that a clear consensus has not yet emerged in scholarship as to who the Deuteronomist(s) were. The variegated facets of Deuteronomy with its various layers of tradition have not made the problem any simpler either. But since our primary concern here is not the authorship of Deuteronomy *per se*, but the beginning of the Deuteronomic movement in Israel, we may now address ourselves to that problem.

PART II

It is commonly acknowledged among Old Testament scholars [16] that the introduction of the monarchical system in Israel gave birth to some tension between the new establishment typified by Jerusalem, and the old ideal of rural particularistic Israel typified by the Shiloh of olden days. The Monarchy as an innovation in Israelite life made some effort to consolidate itself and become acceptable by engaging in conciliatory policies which were not completely acceptable to the people. Its accommodation and adjustments to the sedentary Canaanite culture i.e. the Jerusalem Jebusites, for instance, was not popular with the conservative Israelites.

During this period, the immediate heir to the Shiloh sanctuary, Nob, saw itself as the bulwark of the old system and of true Yahweh worship in contradistinction to the syncretistic Jerusalem cult of the monarchy. Saul probably sensed the incipient sacral importance of Nob early and decided to erase it by commanding the annihilation of its priesthood on the very flimsy excuse of showing kindness to the King's enemies. Unfortunately, Saul's Israelite runners saw the execution of the king's command as sacrilege, (I Chron. 16:22) and refused to act. It was only the non Yahwist Edomite mercenary Doeg who carried out the order and killed about 85 priests (I Sam. 22:18). The gravity of this crime on

---

[16]   See Aelred Cody, *A History of the Old Testament Priesthood*, (Rome Pontifical Biblical Institute), 1969, p.108.

Nob, the legitimate heir of Shiloh[17] whose high priest Ahimelech had direct ancestral link with Eli, the Chief Priest of Shiloh, and the importance of the Nob sanctuary itself which though located in Benhamen, yet housed the sword of Goliath (I Sam. 22:10) killed by David a Judean, was enough to arouse resentment against the monarchy. As I Sam. 22:20 has it, it was only Abiathar who escaped the cold-blooded massacre because he fled with David.

The impact of Saul's crime on the Nob Levites was, however, later cushioned by David when he became king of Israel. In recognition of the services rendered to him by Abiathar and in a bid to perpetuate the Levite lineage of priests, he made Abiathar the high priest of Jerusalem. In this action, the priesthood of the house of Eli took consolation in the fact that Eli's house was still in control of the central cult of the land like Shiloh. As we shall see later, this is probably why David is projected as the ideal king after the heart of Yahweh while Saul is condemned outright, even for sins from which he could had been exonerated.[18]

But as the reign of David ebbed to its close, the situation gravitated back to its ugly beginning from where David had picked it up.

The palace intrigue which put on the throne a successor to David apparently split the religio-political seat of power into two camps as we find epitomised in the support mustered by the two contenders - Solomon and Adonijah. While the modernists or upstarts, Zadok and Beniah, supported Solomon, the conservatives Abiathar and Joab rallied round Adonijah.

The ultimate succession of Solomon to the throne and his subsequent reshuffling of the cult cabinet which made Zadok the high priest and retired Abiathar to Anathoth, where he had to stay under house arrest, was very disturbing to the Levites. With Abiathar thus defrocked (I Kings 2:26-27, 35) the high priesthood of the Temple passed on to the line of Zadok. And, what is more, any other priests

---

[17]   J. Morgenstein, 'The Ark, the Ephod and the Tent of Meeting', *HUCA* 18, (1944), p.9.

[18]   Cf. I Samuel 15:1 ft.

other than the Zadokites had to earn their living from, then on as subordinate clerics.

This new arrangement put two non Israelites or half Israelites in power, Solomon the son of Bathsheba, and Zadok the Jebusite. This, in addition to what Saul did earlier, drove the disgruntled Levites underground to bemoan their fate and reconsider their position. The arrival of the defrocked Abiathar to his estate among them[19] would provide a rallying point for their own 'government in exile'. It would be an opportunity for them, under the leadership of Abiathar, to put their thoughts down in writing and appraise the situation in which they found themselves.[20] This, of course, would make them keep a critical eye on the royal and cultic establishments in Israel and it would explain why in their writing they would not see anything good in the two establishments. It is worth noting that even Jeremiah the prophet hailed from Anathoth and also belonged to the priestly line. It is, therefore, not difficult to assume where he imbibed his iconoclastic ideas which made him very ruthless towards the religious and cultic establishments of his day as he carried out his mission to pull down, uproot and to destroy (Jer. 1:10).

The wound which the Levites sustained on the retirement of Abiathar which eclipsed their line of priesthood in the Temple may probably be responsible for the failure of the priests from the North and in other high places outside Jerusalem to take up appointments in Jerusalem (I Kings 23:9). Without doubt, at the time, the relationship between them and the Zadokites would have been seriously strained. With the original line of the priesthood thus eliminated and the new line of Zadok substituted, the Zadokites made

---

19   Anathoth was a levitical city in Benjamin about 3 miles North of Jerusalem. The birth place of Jeremiah, now called Anata.

20   G. von Rad had recognised this group and its activities when as a result of the protestant atmosphere of their work, he described them as a body of Levites turned proletarian and who had evidently outgrown the cultic sphere proper and was busying itself with the scholarly preservation and transmission of the old tradition. see *Studies in Deuteronomy.* London: S.C.M., 1953, p.68.

efforts to consolidate as well as to legitimise themselves in office. In the process, Zadok was given fictitious genealogies which have made him a controversial figure.

Over the years, it has been difficult for Old Testament scholars to agree on the nationality and true genealogical line of Zadok.[21] The two genealogies so far provided for him have both been written off. While one is certainly due to textual corruption, the other has been described as a pious fabrication of a later age.[22] In II Samuel 8:17, he is mentioned as the son of Ahitub and a member of David's Jerusalem administration. If Ahitub is considered to be his father, the this means he was Abiathar's uncle and therefore of the family of Eli. But in I Chronicles 24:3, he is described as belonging to the house of Eleazar which is contrasted with the house of Ithamar to which Eli belonged. Moreover, in I Sam 22:18-19 we are not told that any other priest other than Abiathar of the house of Ahitub survived Doeg's massacre. And even in I Sam. 2:35-36, his house is presented as a substitute for the house of Eli to which II Sam. 8:17 says he belongs. At one point, efforts were made to give him a direct line of descent from Aaron, the 'forefather of Israelite priesthood,' (I Chr. 5:30-34: 6:35-38). Wherever he appears beside Abiathar as in I Sam. 15:24-29, there are two accounts of him — a sign of the frantic effort to legitimise him in office. In some places, the account is so bad that we cannot actually say who he was;in II Sam. 8:17; Ez. 7:2, he is the son of Ahitub; in I Chr. 9:11; Neh. 11:11, he is the grandson of Ahitub. In all these, either the Bible is not referring to the same Ahitub or there are many biblical Zadoks.

---

[21]   See among others, C.E. Hauer (Jr.), 'Who was Zadok' *JBL*. 82, (1963), pp. 89-94; H.H. Rowley, *JBL*. 58, (1939), pp. 113-141; J.R. Bartlett 'Zadok and His successor at Jerusalem', *JTS* NS 19) (1965), pp. 1-18; G. Widengren, *Accadian and Hebrew Psalms of lamentation as Religious Documents*, Uppsala, 1937, p.322; H.R. Hall in A.S. Peake ed. *The people of the book* (Oxford, 1925) p.11; A Bentzen, *Studier over det Zadokidishe Praesteskabs Histories*, 1931, and compare his own summary in *SAW* 51, (1933), pp. 173-176 and A. Cody, *History of Old Testament Priesthood*, (Rome, 1969) pp. 91-92. 22.

[22]   .H.H. Rowley, *JBL* 58, (1939), p.113

It is on account of this genealogical puzzle that some like Hauer and Rowley have expressed the opinion that Zadok should be seen as a Jebusite priest who defected to David's camp either at the capture or prior to the capture of Jerusalem[23] It has even been suggested that he was the priest Saul brought in to serve after killing all the priests at Nob though there is no biblical backing for this notion. This suggestion is plausible in the sense that II Sam 20:25 and II Sam 15:24-29 present him as serving with Abiathar during David's reign. But in I Chr. 16:39 where he is presented as being in charge of the Ark, Israel's most sacred emblem, one wonders how a foreigner could have been allowed to take care of such a sacred and hallowed national cultic object. If it is accepted that he ministered at Gibeon and also probably at Kirjath-Jearin in connection with the Ark, then by the time of Abiathar's retirement, he would have lived more than three score years, and yet, we are told he ministered with the son of Abiathar, (I Chr. 24:6; 18:16). As if the above state of confusion is not enough, I Chr. 12:28 calls him an army leader.

Our conclusion is that the defrocking of Abiathar caused such a stir in Israel that his substitute had to labour much to entrench himself in office. In the process, fictitious genealogies were made up for him and important figures in the Israelite priesthood were given as his father. McConville even thinks that the programme of legislation in Deut. 18:1, 6, 7 about the Levites being given equal status with the Zadokites was rendered ineffective as can be inferred from II Kings 23:9 because the Zadokites ensured by their position that this legislation did not work so that the Levites remained and continued where they were in the high places.[24]

The implication of this is that the substitution of what was perhaps an originally Jebusite dynasty of priests in place of that of

---

[23]   Haner, *JBL* 82, (1963), p.89 ff; Rowley, *JBL* 58, (1939), p.113. But F.M. Cross would like to uphold Zadok's Levitical Ancestry, see *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, Cambridge Mass, 1973, pp. 55 ff supported by Haran Temples and Temple Services in Ancient Israel (Jerusalem), 1978, p.88.

[24]   J.G. McConville, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*, *JSOT* Suppl. Series 33, (Sheffield, 1984) p.125.

the Elides, set up an antipathy between the Zadokites and those who favoured the Israelite levitical Elide line of Abiathar. And because it was Solomon who gave the rift the prominence it received, he and his successor as well as the Zadokites became the target of the opposing group. It made Solomon's foreign and home policies easy preys for the group which sought to justify its claim and stance. But as a dissident voice, they were often snubbed by the king and his echelon along with the cultic officials because they were recognised for what they were, a disgruntled dissident group. And they had a tradition of not seeing anything good in the monarchy and the cult. It is even probable that the allegation we have against Jeroboam I in II Chron. 13:9 and I Kings 13:33, led to the exit of some Levites in the Northern sanctuaries who would not co-operate to meet their defrocked father, Abiathar Thus they increased or strengthened the new movement by a vote of no confidence in the new system, kingship and cult.[25]

This apparent alignment of opposing forces and interests between the new order in the Jerusalem kingship and Zadokites, and the representatives of the religious traditions of old Israel - the Levites, constituted the beginning of the movement which was later christened the Deuteronomic movement with its dissident outlook. The Levites who rallied round Abiathar now saw themselves as the symbol of Shiloh, the centre of traditional Israelite Yahwism unsullied by Canaanite influence. Their stance made them the idealistic centre of those elements opposed to the new centre at Jerusalem where strategic adaptation to Canaanite co-existence with Canaanite conversion and absorption into Yahwism had taken place and where foreign influence had had its full sway.

This conservative group[26] prided itself on its fidelity to the Ancient Covenant. Understandably enough, they opposed the entrenched priesthoods of the royal establishments, not only out of

---

[25]   S. Talmon, however has his doubt as to whether all the priests from the North were Levites. See his 'Divergences in Calendar-Reckoning in Ephraim and Judah', *VT* 8, (1958), pp.53 ft.

[26]   See H.W. Wolff, 'Hoseas Geistige Heimat', *Th LZ* 81, (1956), pp. 83-94.

rivalry, but from religious ideals too. Of course, in this they had the co-operation of the prophets like Hosea who shared this same spirit of fidelity to the old purely Israelite Yahwism. It is even the opinion of Wolff that Hosea did not only share in the ideals of this group, but also showed considerable sympathy for these non-official levitical circles.[27]

Thus, the nucleus which gathered itself round the defrocked Abiathar can be seen as the nucleus of the movement which metamorphosed into 'Deuteronomism' in Israel. If our submission is accepted, it will answer some of the problems so far posed in Old Testament studies but which have not been adequately answered.

PART III

In the above, we have tried to maintain that the retirement of Abiathar by Solomon constituted the religio-political situation which gave birth to the gathering of a levitical nucleus which later metamorphosed into the Deuteronomic School. In this section, we want to examine some of the popularly acknowledged traits of Deuteronomism to see how far they are found in this levitical circle.

First, our proposition by implication affirms that the candidates for the Deuteronomic School are to be found among the priests. It is commonly agreed among Old Testament scholars that teaching and exposition constitute the major features demonstrated by the Deuteronomic author.[28] Although Hoppe has tried to argue that the elders of Israel were the best qualified to fill this position[29], the biblical evidence we have points to the contrary, giving the credit to the priest whose primary task was teaching and exposition (Deut. 33:10; II Chron. 17:7-9; 35:3; Neh. 8:7-8; Deut. 27:9; etc). Abiathar and his brother Levites would therefore qualify as author(s).

---

[27]   Here see A.H.J. Gunneweg, *Leviten und Priester*, Göttingen, 1965, p.71 ff.

[28]   See G. von Rad, 'The FormCritical Problem of the Hexateuch', in his, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), pp. 1-18.

[29]   L.J. Hoppe, *Biblical Research*, 28, (1983), pp. 27-36.

But the question then arises: if the candidates for the Deuteronomic School were priests, why do they manifest anti-priest tendencies, even, at times, giving a poor portrait of the priesthood? With the background we have given, this is not surprising because they were reacting against the usurpation of the Elides position by the Zadokites who constituted the official clerics in the Temple. The subtle polemics or abuses of the priesthood were directed against the Zadokites whom they now saw as their enemies.

This leads to the next question which is usually a puzzle in Old Testament studies. How was Yahwist exclusivism maintained and retained in the atmosphere of the royal cult centres of the two kingdoms which was riddled with compromise and syncretism? (Amaziah and Amos at Bethel, Amos 7:10-15; II Kings 11:18; Jerusalem with a Temple of Baal, I Kings 16:32 Ahab built an altar and house of Baal and Manasseh built altars for Baal in Jerusalem). Evidently, at this time, the Yahwist priests in the official sanctuaries were not particularly zealous for any ideal nor were they inclined to oppose the royal policies. It was, therefore, the Abiathar group who claimed to stand in the tradition of the fathers and to be unaffected by the immediate surveillance of the king and his agents that could afford to have an ideal or tradition to maintain. Through them, the Yahweh alone party, with the aid of prophets who aligned themselves to them, survived in Israel.

Over the years, scholars have noted that the description of the figure David in the succession narrative presents a striking contrast to that in the history of his rise to power. From what we have in II Samuel chapters 2 to 7, we see David in the account of his rise to power as a blessed person chosen by Yahweh himself as king. But in II Samuel chapters 9-24, which give the succession account, David is portrayed as an object of scandal, a man of indecision and a dotard. One wonders, as Tomoo Ishida[30] has well noted, why a writer could so persistently continue to disclose in the succession narrative the weak points and decadence of David. The reason for

---

[30]   See his article, 'Solomon's Succession to the Throne of David - A Political Analysis', in *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays*, ed. by Tomoo Ishida, Tokyo, 1982.

this is to see the work from the political standpoint of those with a critical attitude towards the regime of David who assisted Solomon to establish his kingship. The group of the 'Abiatharites', though, hold David as their mentor and as doyen of all Israel, yet want to show that at the time he helped Solomon, who retired Abiathar, to take the throne after him, he had deteriorated and lost the full impact of the glory and blessedness of Yahweh. By so doing, they have implicitly discredited Solomon and the ground is eroded, as it were, from under his feet. Therefore the shadow of Divine favour did not fall on him.[31]

This also explains the difference between the way Yahweh behaved towards David and towards Saul. When compared with the king before and the kings after him David stands head and shoulders above them all. He was the king under whom Abiathar functioned in his rightful position as the High Priest of Israel. Others committed sins that others committed and had no forgiveness for them, e.g. Saul, (I Samuel 13; 15). But when David committed similar sins and even more heinous ones, he was granted forgiveness. Yahweh did not forgive Saul, the man who ordered Doeg against the priests at Nob! Moreover, Solomon's character is painted as a bane in Israelite kingship. Apart from David, almost all other kings fall short of the esteem of this group, the Deuteronomists. In fact after David there came a longing that a man like him would arise. In the passage of time this longing was theologically developed and was couched in Messianic terms, but it represented a hope that was never realised in Old Testament times.

As we mentioned earlier, the socio-political situation in which the Abiathar group found themselves made them develop what Von Rad has described as 'the protestant atmosphere of the Deuteronomists.'[32] Gerhard Von Rad sensed that at the time, the Levites who authored Deuteronomy had outgrown the cult and were no longer concerned with the cultic centre. But the truth of the

---

[31] See Ahlstrom 'Solomon the Chosen One', *HR* 8, (1968), p.100, Note 29.

[32] G. von Rad. 'The Provenance of Deuteronomy' in *his Studies in Deuteronomy*, London: S.C.M., (1953), p.68.

matter is that they were really no longer in the official list of clerics in the central cult, having been displaced by the Zadokites. As a result they developed a critical attitude towards the cult and its functionaries, a fact which made them see things from the dissident point of view.

As opponents of the Jerusalem cultic functionaries, they were not only out to criticise but even to discredit some of the avowed cultic theological formulations. This point brings us to what has been styled the demythologisation traits of the Deuteronomist. Although the Deuteronomist, i.e. the Abiathar group, still held the central sanctuary in honour it was bent on divesting it of God's actual immanence within it. In this connection, when the central cult was making too much of the Ark as the visible presence of the invisible Yahweh, the Deuteronomist came in to correct the view that after all, the Ark is only a receptacle for the two tables of Stone, (Deut. 10:1-5; Ex.25:10-25). This radical reinterpretation or rationalisation of an old view could only have arisen as a counter to a more elaborate view probably then current in Jerusalem.[33] Like the voice of a reformer, they were out to curb the religious and theological excesses of the cult. From their point of view the theology of election concerns Yahweh and Israel and not Yahweh and the king. Much as they loved David, they were not prepared to recognise the perpetuity of Davidic posterity because of the misbehaviour of his son. This radical re-interpretation was extended to Yahweh's relationship with the land of Canaan in which the cult served as a mediating link.[34] To the Abiatharites, this sounded abhorrent! They believed that the bond between Yahweh and the land was morally rather than cultically conditioned. The cult where their members only served as subordinates is thus being robbed of the high esteem in which others held it. In the course of the group's demythologisation policy, it also implicitly engaged in subtle

---

[33]   The view that W.R. Arnold has expressed that there could have been two arks is not our concern here. For his views, see 'Ephod and Ark', *Havard Theological Studies* III (1917), pp. 23 ft.

[34]   See R.E. Clements 'Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition', *VT* 15 (1965), pp. 317-318, and Hoppe L.J., p.31.

polemics against a sacral interpretation of various aspects of Israelite life.

In the light of the above, we can see that the members of the Deuteronomic School were certainly not official members of the central cult but rather Levites who, because of their distance from the cult, had started viewing cultic activities from a different perspective.[35] The fact that they regarded the central cultic officiates as their opponents precluded their viewing things from the perspective of those officiates.

This means their social setting as a group and their historical background gave colouring to their views and actions. If we understand the origin of Biblical Deuteronomism in this light it will help us to understand some of the peculiar traits of the Deuteronomic Movement which have been so puzzling to Old Testament students.

Rev. Dr. J. O. Akao.
University of Nigeria.

---

[35]   Cf M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) pp. 59-157.

Traditions of Theology in Glasgow (1450-1990), W. I. P. Hazlett (editor) (Glasgow: Scottish Academic Press) ISBN 07073 0733 33. £15.00.

Given its scope (540 years of theology in Glasgow) and its size (9 essays comprising 112 pages) this little volume is rightly described as a miscellany. While the essays vary in length and style, each is interesting in its own right. Some fascinating facts are highlighted. For example, in the pre-Reformation period the University boasted only four faculties: Arts, Civil Law, Canon Law and Theology. In this same period the total student body averaged 25 with about 10 graduations annually. Lectures were delivered in Latin until the eighteenth century.

Many famous names are sprinkled through the text: Andrew Melville, Francis Hutcheson, John Caird, William Hastie, George Adam Smith, William Barclay. The description of the latter by the current Professor of Hebrew is guaranteed to attract attention. 'Ugly, gruff, deaf, stinking of tobacco and a great toper, he was a legendary figure in his own lifetime as a communicator of the Christian gospel ... In my opinion, much of what he actually said was just nineteenth century religious liberalism'. More circumspect is the comment upon the labours of Patrick Fairbairn, Professor of New Testament in Trinity College (1856-74), 'He wrote extensively on the relationship of the Old and the New Testaments though without shedding much light on it'. (A sentiment possibly echoed by many theology lecturers when marking student scripts!). Perhaps the most interesting character described in this book is William Hastie who was jailed in Calcutta for failing to pay a fine in relation to his unsuccessful court case against a fellow missionary, a Miss Pigot, yet he became Professor of Divinity in Glasgow in 1895.

Reflective opinions are offered by some contributors, most noticeably the idea that denominational orthodoxy and theological scholarship are mutually exclusive. Past insistence upon credal orthodoxy has consistently restricted serious attempts at scholarship. The corollary of this assumption is that it was the more dynamic thinking and evangelical fervour within the fold of the Free Church scholars at Trinity College which led inevitably to a rash of disruptive heresy trials in the late nineteenth century.

This slim volume provides food for thought on the whole subject of theological education and may inspire some readers to further research and analysis.

L. S. Kirkpatrick.

High Churchmanship in the Church of England, Kenneth Hylson-Smith, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993). £29.95.

This is a panoramic study of a strand in the Church of England stretching from the sixteenth to the twentieth century. The story is traced through a chain of figures including Hooker, Lancelot Andrewes, George Herbert, Nicholas Ferrar, William Laud and the Caroline divines, the Hackney Phalanx, the Oxford Movement with special emphasis upon Keble, Newman and Pusey, the Tractarians and their successors in the slum priests with their florid ritualism, their zealous evangelical preaching and their self-sacrificing lives, the heroic figures in the Universities Mission to Central Africa, and the scholarly figures of the late nineteenth century and of the twentieth century, among which are noted Charles Gore, Gregory Dix and Michael Ramsey and many more.

These pages abound with concise and incisive biographical sketches. What was it that entitles such a diverse sequence of people to be labeled as High Church?

Dr Hylson-Smith sees the binding features to be acceptance of the supremacy of Scriptures, the central teaching of the Scriptures as set forth in the Creeds, the teaching of the Fathers as a sound doctrinal guide, the historic threefold ministry, the form of worship in the Book of Common Prayer, and the duty of living the Christian life.

The figures in the sequence held these tenets with so considerable a variety of emphasis that it is often difficult to see a common pattern. For example, the Caroline divines were loyal to their episcopal system and believed it to have apostolic warrant, but many of them did not unchurch the continental Churches which, in their view, had not retained episcopacy because the pre-Reformation bishops were unwilling to share in the necessary reform. This contrasts with later High Churchmen who have made the acceptance of episcopacy essential for the existence of the Church.

There has also been in the Church of England the strand known as the Evangelical tradition with its stress upon the Scriptures and the Reformation heritage. In the nineteenth century, the Evangelicals often regarded the Tractarians as deviants from the proper position of the Church of England and from the Reformed emphasis upon justification by faith. Yet, as this book points out, the ritualistic slum priests were zealous evangelical preachers who drew many to firm trust in Jesus as Saviour and Lord. Stanton, one such figure, said 'Nothing must ever take away our rest in the old Evangelical love and trust in Jesus'; he stressed that Christians were blood-bought persons, drawn to a personal Saviour. In the present century, Archbishop Michael Ramsey was counted as within the High-Church tradition and yet, as this book notes, 'he believed that there was no fundamental conflict between the Evangelical and the Catholic elements in the Church of England -- they were utterly one'. Ramsey himself was at home in and was warmly welcomed to Evangelical assemblies. Nevertheless, the tension remains and is often evidence in debates in the General Synod.

Dr Hylson-Smith considers that over recent decades the High-church strand has lost a great deal of its nerve and of its influence in the Church of England. He clearly thinks it would be for the good of the Church if it were to be renewed with a clear vision of its doctrine and practice.

This is a lucid, well-documented and impressive work. For those already acquainted with the field, it provides a fine refresher course; for those coming fresh to the field, it will provide an illuminating guide.

R. Buick Knox.

Jesus Christ for Today's World, Jürgen Moltmann (London: SCM Press, 1994). £6.95

Jürgen Moltmann's most recent contribution to his unfolding theology is another interim work which, as the cover blurb notes, 'represents a stage between Professor Moltmann's *The Way of Jesus Chris*, and the volume on eschatology which he shortly will be adding to his systematic theology'. This volume of Moltmann would

be of particular value to those who desire to preach his various doctrines from the "Crucified" and "Suffering God" to his current interests with ecology and the Jewish Christian dialogue. The book is essentially a series of Moltmann's recent public lectures and as such is an accessible and genuine volume of his thought.

The book consists of eight chapters. It is prefaced by the essay 'Who is Jesus Christ for us Today?' in which Moltmann makes the impassioned plea that our creeds be expanded to include the factual and spiritual aspects which inhabit the space between 'born' and 'suffered' and which he believes form the substance of the sermons which follow.

In the body of the work Moltmann deals with the familiar issues of the suffering of Christ on the Cross, the anxiety of Christ and the place of Christian/Jewish dialogue. It is through his own particular experience as a former prisoner that he brings new insight into the place of the torturers as well as those tortured. His insight into the current issues surrounding the ever developing dialogue between Christians and Jews is sensitive to the recent development in this delicate area following the Holocaust and the horrors of Auschwitz.

In addition Moltmann raises the question of the concept of a cosmic Christ following Chernobyl. How can we sanctify the concept of life in a nuclear age?

As previously noted this book is again one which does not possess a coherent or novel thesis. It reiterates issues which have concerned Moltmann for several decades. It is, however, a very human book and in many ways makes the theology of his larger, and greater, works accessible and preachable to the pastor in the congregation. For anyone who continues to enjoy his insights this book remains an acceptable interim work while waiting for further theological reflection.

D. J. Templeton

A Tale of Two Missions, Michael Goulder (London: SCM, 1994)
£9.95.

Professor Goulder's book is comparatively small; it is
written in a most readable style; it could be understood, as the author
says, by 'sixth-form students, first year undergraduates, theological
students, the general reader: what Bernard Shaw called the intelligent
woman, but one has to be so careful these days'; but its clear style
should not deceive one into thinking that it is a bland, popular
introduction to early Church history. As the author says, it has taken
twenty years in development and is a most controversial book.

Professor Goulder's thesis is that there never was a single,
undivided church which can be somehow reconstructed for us by
early church historians; instead there were two missions. One of
these was run by Peter and James ands was centred in Jerusalem; the
second was run by Paul and his followers and was centred in Antioch
and other centres. There were major theological disagreements
between the two missions and Professor Goulder takes the reader
through the New Testament reconstructing these disagreements from
his reading of the text. He attempts to determine the attitude of the
various New Testament writers towards the two missions by
applying to each in turn a *loyalty* test. He says 'To understand the
New Testament it is essential to know which side the various authors
are on, Paul's or the Jerusalem leaders'. According to this test,

The areas of theological debate which Professor Goulder
deals with are certainly of importance to the New Testament and of
great interest to present day readers. The include Meat, wine and
Sabbath (chapter 4), the Whole Law (chapter 5), the Kingdom
(chapter 6), Tongues and Visions (chapter 7), the Gifts and the
Fruits of the Spirit (chapter 8), Sex (chapter 9), Money (chapter 10),
Ministry and the Church (chapter 11), the future (chapter 12), the
Spirit (chapter 13), Messiah (chapter 14), Possession Christology
(chapter 15-18), Incarnation (chapter 19), Lord and Son of God
(chapter 20), Son of Man (chapter 21), Monotheism (chapter 22),
life after death (chapter 23), Jesus' Resurrection (chapter 24) -- and
all in the space of less than 200 pages!

The breadth of topics covered illustrates the strengths and
the weaknesses of this book. On the one hand, almost every topic

that a theological student will be asked to deal with in her or his three years of study or almost every question that the intelligent layperson will ask about the New Testament in a lifetime. This makes the book a very interesting read and keeps the reader's interest to the last page. There are no tedious arguments to slow the pace of the discussion down. On the other hand, however, the book is written without footnotes and without any dialogue with the many scholars who have written on the many themes. As a result, the reader is left with a summary of Professor Goulder's views rather than a rounded discussion of the topic. Those who know Professor Goulder's erudition and have read his other books or listened to him at conferences will know that that dialogue certainly takes place --- unfortunately there is no hint of it in the book.

Professor Goulder has written a fascinating book, though, as he himself admits, the thesis is very similar to that of the Tübingen School in the last century. He has, however, promised a more fascinating one -- an 800 page statement which will develop the arguments presented in this book. We wish him well in his retirement and look forward to the appearance of this book which the freedom from academic bureaucracy will allow him to write in the very near future. It is a book which will be the occasion of eager debate.

J. C. McCullough

A Comprehensive Guide to Computer Study. Up-to-Date Information on the Best Software and Techniques, Jeffrey Hsu (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1993.

There is a great need for a book which would explain in plain English the intricacies of computing, particularly with reference to Word-processing, Data-bases, Electronic Bibles and Inter-netting. Jeffrey Hsu sets out to fill this gap, but having eagerly read the book, this reviewer is left wondering what audience the book was intended for. For someone with even a rudimentary knowledge of computing, the section on computing (parts 1 and 2) is too simple; for someone with any experience of exegesis and Bible Study, the section on applying computer technology to Bible Study (part 3) is too naive.

The book, however, does fill an important gap in many Biblical scholars' knowledge by providing an excellent up-to-day reference section on currently available software. These 26 pages are worth their weight in gold,, particularly for ministers and lecturers who keep getting asked 'what software would you recommend for ...?'

This book, then, is for the **very** beginner who is just entering on the world of computing. Perhaps Word Publishing could follow this book up with another for the intermediate or more advanced enthusiast?

<div align="right">

J. C. McCullough

</div>